

REMARKS

Claims 42-48, 50, 51, 55 and 57 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 1 – 41, 52 – 54 and 56 were cancelled previously.

In the Final Office Action dated January 19, 2011, the Examiner rejected claims 42-48, 50, 51, 55 and 57.

With this response, claim 42 was amended for clarification purposes only. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the Amendment. Support for the amendment can be found on at least page 9 of the specification.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112 Indefiniteness Rejection of Claims

Claims 42-48, 50, 51, 55 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response to the Examiner's rejection, Applicant amended the claims to recite specific compounds and to clarify which salts may be introduced into the polymer. Support for this Amendment can be found on page 9 of the Specification. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the above rejection is now moot and respectfully requests that it be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of Claims

Claims 42, 44, 48, 50, 51 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52-063189 and Sugo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,783,608).

Claims 45-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52-063189, Sugo et al. and in further view of Grant et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,242,503).

Claims 43 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52-063189, Sugo et al. and in further view of Rodman (U.S. Patent No. 3,375,933).

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the above listed rejections.

The claims require a cleansing method that includes the steps of providing a cleansing processing agent in a solid state which is non-water soluble and treating said polymer with an acid and/or an alkali and introducing and introducing at least one compound selected from the group consisting of carboxylic acid, carboxylic acid salts, OH, OH salts, $\text{PO}(\text{OH})_2$, $\text{PO}(\text{OH})_2$ salts, $\text{CH}_2\text{PO}(\text{OH})_2$, and $\text{CH}_2\text{PO}(\text{OH})_2$ salts into the polymer.

JP 55-157604 teaches treating an acrylonitrile-styrene copolymer with concentrated sulfuric acid. JP 55-157604 does not teach or even fairly the step of treating a polymer with an acid and or an alkali and introducing least one compound selected from the group consisting of carboxylic acid, carboxylic acid salts, OH, OH salts, $\text{PO}(\text{OH})_2$, $\text{PO}(\text{OH})_2$ salts, $\text{CH}_2\text{PO}(\text{OH})_2$, and $\text{CH}_2\text{PO}(\text{OH})_2$ salts into the polymer as required by the claims. Indeed, the treatment of the acrylonitrile-styrene copolymer with concentrated sulfuric acid merely sulfonates the styrene unit and hydrolyzes the acrylonitrile unit. As such, JP 55-157604 does not teach or even fairly suggest all the required claim limitations.

Thus, because JP 55-157604 fails to teach or even fairly suggest all the required elements of the claims, claims 42, 44, 48, 50, 51 and 55 are patentable over the above cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, the rejection of dependent claims 43, 45-47 and 57 which are based in part on JP 55-157604 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 21, 2011

By: / Anne K.W. Sutton/
Anne K.W. Sutton
Registration No. 59,592
SNR Denton US LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000